

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
8 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
9

10 JOSEPH ANTONETTI,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 DWIGHT NEVEN, *et al.*,

14 Defendants.
15

Case No. 2:08-CV-01020-KJD-LRL

ORDER

16 Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider (#9). Defendants filed a
17 response in opposition (#11) to which Plaintiff replied. Having read and considered Plaintiff's
18 motion and good cause lacking it is denied. Motions for reconsideration are committed to the
19 discretion of the trial court. See School Dist. No. 1J. Mutlinomah County v. ACandS, Inc., 5 F.3d
20 1255, 1262 (9th Cir. 1993). Where reconsideration of a non-final order is sought, the court has
21 inherent jurisdiction to modify, alter or revoke it. See United States v. Martin, 226 F.3d 1042, 1049
22 (9th Cir. 2000); Glavor v. Shearson Lehman Hutton, Inc., 879 F. Supp. 1028, 1032 (N.D. Cal. 1994)
23 ("District courts are authorized to reconsider interlocutory orders at any time prior to final
24 judgment."). Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that the Court's screening of his proposed amended
25 complaint was in clear error.
26

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Reconsider (#9) is
2 **DENIED.**

3 DATED this 14TH day of May 2010.
4

5 
6

7 _____
8 Kent J. Dawson
9 United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26